

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES  
OF THE  
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Rodney G. Mayer, Acting Chief  
Division of Flood Management  
Department of Water Resources  
The Resources Agency  
State of California\*

---

\*Presented before The Reclamation Board in Sacramento, California on July 21, 2006



## WATER CONDITIONS

On July 1, Water Year 2006 (October 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006) statewide hydrologic conditions were as follows: precipitation, 140% of average to date; runoff, 170% of average to date; and reservoir storage, 120% for the date. As of June 13, the date of the last runoff forecast for this season, the projected median April-July runoff indicated the following percents of historical averages for the State's water supply basins: Shasta through American, 187%; Mokelumne through San Joaquin, 180%; and the Kings through Kern, 176%. On June 30, Water Year 2006 unimpaired runoff observed for the Sacramento River Region was 30.3 million acre-feet (MAF), which is 172% of average. (In contrast, on June 30, 2005, the observed Sacramento River Region unimpaired runoff since October 1, 2004 was 16.9 MAF.) For Water Year 2006, both the median Sacramento and San Joaquin Valley Water Year Type indices are both classified as "Wet."

The Northern Sierra 8-Station Index's seasonal total as of July 1, was 80.2", which is 165% of the seasonal normal to date and 160% of a normal Water Year (50"). (Last year at this time, the 8-Stations had 57.2", or 118% of the seasonal normal.) Water Year 2006 is now the fifth wettest year for the 8-Station precipitation record. Most locations in Northern and Central California, as well as the Pacific Northwest, also had above average seasonal precipitation. South of the Tehachapi Mountains, however, Southern California is still below normal, as is much of the American Southwest. Severe drought continues in portions of Southern Arizona, which had one of the driest winters on record.

Selected Cities Precipitation Accumulation as of 06/30/2006 (end of the National Weather Service Water Year)					
	Jul 1 to Date 2005 - 2006 (in inches)	% Avg	Jul 1 to Date 2004 - 2005 (in inches)	% Avg	% Avg Jul 1 to Jun 30 2005 - 2006
Eureka	58.84	154	44.41	117	154
Redding	45.31	135	38.77	116	135
Sacramento	25.63	129	24.53	123	129
San Jose	22.54	149	24.47	162	149
Fresno	14.56	130	15.84	141	130
Bakersfield	6.85	106	9.20	142	106
Los Angeles	13.19	87	37.25	246	87
San Diego	5.42	50	22.49	209	50

Key Reservoir Storage (1,000 AF) as of 06/30/2006 midnight								
Reservoir	River	Storage	Avg Storage	% Average	Capacity	% Capacity	Flood Control Encroachment	Total Space Available
Trinity Lake	Trinity	2,277	2,132	107	2,448	93	---	171
Shasta Lake	Sacramento	4,249	3,731	114	4,552	93	-303	303
Lake Oroville	Feather	3,476	2,965	117	3,538	98	-62	62
New Bullards Bar Res	Yuba	900	832	108	966	93	-66	66
Folsom Lake	American	919	838	110	977	94	-58	58
New Melones Res	Stanislaus	2,349	1,494	157	2,420	97	-71	71
Don Pedro Res	Tuolumne	2,003	1,578	127	2,030	99	-27	27
Lake McClure	Merced	1,015	732	139	1,025	99	-9	10
Millerton Lake	San Joaquin	523	417	125	520	101	3	-3
Pine Flat Res	Kings	987	703	140	1,000	99	-13	13
Isabella	Kern	380	293	130	568	67	-188	188
San Luis Res	(Offstream)	1,696	1,393	122	2,039	83	---	343

The latest National Weather Service Climate Prediction Center long-range weather forecast maps for July, issued June 15, suggest average precipitation for almost all of California, except for the far northeastern corner, which is forecast to be below normal. Below normal rainfall is also expected for most areas of the Pacific Northwest. Temperatures are forecast to be above normal for much of the American Southwest and almost all of California, except for northeastern California, which is forecast to have average temperatures.

## **STATE AND FEDERAL DISASTER DECLARATIONS AND DAMAGE COST ESTIMATES FOR THE JANUARY AND APRIL 2006 FLOODING**

### **December 2005 and January 2006 Storms:**

By proclamations dated January 2, 2006, January 3, 2006, and January 12, 2006, the Governor proclaimed a state of emergency to exist in 34 of 58 counties due to damages caused by later December and early January 2006 storms. On January 18, 2006, the Governor requested President Bush to declare a major disaster for the State of California. The President responded on February 3, 2006, by declaring that a major disaster exists in the State of California and ordered federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in areas struck by severe storms, flooding, mudslides, and landslides from December 17, 2005, through and including January 3, 2006. The President's action makes federal funding available to affected individuals in the 10 counties of Contra Costa, Del Norte, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, Sacramento, Siskiyou, Solano, and Sonoma. Federal funding also is available to State and eligible local governments and certain private nonprofit organizations on a cost-sharing basis for emergency work and the repair or replacement of damaged facilities in the 29 counties of Alpine, Amador, Butte, Colusa, Contra Costa, Del Norte, El Dorado, Humboldt, Lake, Lassen, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Sierra, Siskiyou, Solano, Sonoma, Sutter, Trinity, Yolo, and Yuba. Additional designations may be made at a later date if requested by the State and warranted by the results of further damage assessments.

The preliminary damage cost estimate for the winter 2005-06 storm is about \$161 million (DR-1628). DWR spent about \$5 million for responding to these storms. DWR's cost is included in the Governor's Office of Emergency Services damage estimate of \$161 million.

### **April 2006 Storms:**

By proclamations dated April 10, 2006, April 13, 2006, May 2, 2006, and May 10, 2006 the Governor proclaimed a state of emergency to exist in 40 of 58 counties due to damages caused by these storms. On June 5, 2006 the President declared a major disaster exists in the State of California and ordered federal aid to supplement

State and local recovery efforts in areas struck by severe storms, flooding, mudslides, and landslides from March 29, 2006 to April 16, 2006. Federal funding is available to State and eligible local governments and certain private nonprofit organizations on a cost-sharing basis for emergency work and the repair or replacement of damaged facilities in the 17 counties of Alameda, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Lake, Madera, Marin, Merced, Napa, Nevada, Placer, San Joaquin, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Sonoma, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne.

The preliminary damage cost estimate for the April 2006 storm is about \$69.5 million (DR-1646). DWR spent about \$10 million for responding to April high water incidents. Again, DWR's cost for responding to April storms is included in the Governor's Office of Emergency Services damage estimate of \$69.5 million.

## **FLOOD PROJECT INSPECTION / INTEGRITY EVALUATIONS**

### **Inspection/Integrity Evaluation Procedures**

The spring State Inspections were completed on June 16, 2006. A quarterly report covering March to May is nearly complete and includes a major change showing new compliance ratings using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Inspection Guidelines.

High water staking and high water mark surveys for the April flood event have been completed. The Division of Flood Management has initiated Problem Identification Studies for the Sacramento and the San Joaquin River Flood Control Systems for evaluation of system deficiencies. The effort involves collecting geotechnical data, hydraulics and survey data, development of a Geographical Information System (GIS) database, and assessment of exploratory drilling needs based on Corps standard procedures for drilling.

### **Corps PL84-99 Rehabilitation Assistance**

DWR and Corps joint field site evaluations for assessing severity of damage for the January high water flood events were completed on June 16, 2006. The DWR/Corps Emergency Preparedness Branch Meeting was held on June 27, 2006 to review damage assessments and prioritize needed repairs for damaged sites. Based on a unit price of \$4,000 per linear foot, a first rough estimate for repair of about 300 sites is \$500 million. Further dialogue between federal and State agencies is continuing for repairs and this cost will drop dramatically as repair conceptual designs are developed. The Corps lacks funding to perform the repairs. This is a major issue that we now need to address immediately.

The Corps has also issued a 30 Day Notice expiring July 19, 2006 inviting rehabilitation assistance applications for the April flood event with damage mainly to the San Joaquin River Flood Control System. As of early July, the Lower San Joaquin Levee District has requested repairs to 25 sites.

## **JONES TRACT COSTS AND FEMA REIMBURSEMENTS**

The final Jones Tract costs and FEMA reimbursements are as follows:

<b><u>DWR OE&amp;E and Labor</u></b>	<b><u>FEMA Reimbursement</u></b>
--------------------------------------	----------------------------------

\$1,780,000	\$1,651,081
-------------	-------------

<b><u>DWR Contracts</u></b>	
-----------------------------	--

\$17,657,747	\$10,914,725
--------------	--------------

<b><u>CDF</u></b>	
-------------------	--

\$1,330,000	\$997,000
-------------	-----------

<b><u>CCC</u></b>	
-------------------	--

\$516,000	\$387,000
-----------	-----------

<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>	
---------------------	--

\$21,283,747	\$13,949,806
--------------	--------------

## **TRAPPER SLOUGH**

The wrap-up of Trapper Slough monitoring is continuing. DOE Project Geology and DES Site Assessment units are continuing to work on completing final characterization and monitoring reports for the project. It is anticipated that a request for closure and termination of Monitoring and Reporting Program Order No. R5-2004-0841 will be submitted to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board by mid-August 2006.

## LEGISLATION

### Reclamation Board Report July 2006

#### 2006 Legislative Dates of Interest

July 7	Summer Recess begins at the end of this day's session if Budget Bill has been enacted (budget was signed by Governor on 6/30/06).
August 7	Legislature reconvenes.
August 21 - 31	Floor session only.
August 31	Last day for each house to pass bills.
August 31	Final Recess begins at end of this day's session.
September 30	Last day for Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature before September 1 and in his possession on or after September 1.

#### Key Flood Management Legislation

Bill #	Category / Summary	Status
	<b>Administrative / Funding</b>	
<b>AB 140 (Nunez/Perata)</b>  <b>Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006.</b>	<p>The bill establishes a comprehensive financing plan to maintain and improve the State's levee and flood control system and provide for safe, reliable water supplies. The bill places a measure on the November 2006 ballot, which would authorize the sale of \$4.09 billion in general obligation bonds for financing urgent repairs and improvements to the State's flood control system as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Levee Evaluation, Repair and Delta Levee Maintenance (\$3 billion)</li><li>• Flood Control Subventions (\$500 million)</li><li>• Flood Protection Corridor, Bypasses and Mapping (\$290 million)</li><li>• Stormwater Flood Management (\$300 million).</li></ul>	<p>Chapter 33, Statutes of 2006</p> <p>(note: official ballot number is Proposition 1E)</p>
<b>AB 142 (Nunez/Perata)</b>  <b>Flood control: levee repair and flood control systems.</b>	<p>The bill appropriates \$500 million from the General Fund to the Department of Water Resources (DWR) for levee evaluation and repair and to make flood control system improvements. The bill also requires that this appropriation be used to fund levee repairs for critical erosion sites identified in Governor Schwarzenegger's emergency</p>	<p>Chapter 34, Statutes of 2006</p>

Bill #	Category / Summary	Status
	declaration (Executive Order S-01-06).	
<b>AB 1665 (Laird)</b>  <b>Flood control.</b>	<p>This bill would require DWR to notify property owners of flooding hazards; require DWR to prepare reports on the status of the flood control system and the condition of project levees operated by local agencies; require DWR to prepare maps for levee flood protection zones; require DWR to develop an expedited schedule for remapping areas to the 100-year flood standard; clarify that DWR can overlay existing maintenance areas; allow DWR to establish mitigation banks; and provide authority to cost-share environmental enhancements.</p> <p><b>As Amended 6/28/06</b></p>	<p>Senate Appropriations Committee</p>
<b>SB 1796 (Florez)</b>  <b>Reclamation Board</b>	<p>Among other things, the bill would rename The Reclamation Board the Central Valley Flood Protection Board and would declare that The Central Valley Flood Protection Board is a state agency that is independent of DWR. The provision in the bill requiring the Board to act "separately" from DWR has been deleted. In addition, the bill would require the board to consist of 9 members (7 members would be Governor's appointments, subject to Senate confirmation, and two members appointed by the Legislature). The bill also provides conflict-of-interest and ex parte communication requirements for Board members; establishes a full-time pay scale for Board members; requires the Board to prepare a report on the State Plan of Flood Control with assistance from DWR; requires the Board to prepare and submit a preliminary strategic flood protection plan; and requires the Board to review local and regional land use plans to ensure compliance with flood protection and public safety standards adopted by the Board.</p> <p><b>As Amended 6/22/06</b></p>	<p>Assembly Appropriations Committee</p> <p><b>Hearing: 8/9/06</b></p>
<b>ACA 13 (Harman)</b>  <b>Local government: assessments and fees or charges.</b>	<p>This bill would amend Proposition 218 to provide flexibility to local governments in raising revenues for both capital improvement flood projects and operation and maintenance of flood control projects by providing a more fair voting process for the approval of new or increased flood assessments.</p> <p><b>As Amended 4/21/05</b></p>	<p>Held in Assembly Local Government Committee</p>
<b>ACA 30 (Laird)</b>  <b>Local government: flood control</b>	<p>This bill would amend Proposition 218 by providing that, for the purpose of levying a new assessment or increasing an existing assessment to maintain, operate, repair, relocate, or upgrade a flood control levee that was in existence before November 6,</p>	<p>Assembly Floor -Third Reading</p>



Bill #	Category / Summary	Status
assessments.	<p>1996, a majority protest exists if the ballots submitted in opposition represent a majority of the ballots that were mailed to affected property owners.</p> <p><b>As Amended 5/4/06</b></p>	
	<b>Floodplain Development / Land Use</b>	
<p><b>AB 802 (Wolk)</b></p> <p><b>Land use: water supply.</b></p>	<p>This bill would require the land use element of a local general plan to identify areas covered by the general that are subject to flooding as identified by floodplain maps prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency or DWR, upon next revision of the housing element on or after January 1, 2008, and require the conservation element to identify rivers and other waters, flood corridors, riparian habitat, and land that may accommodate floodwater for purposes of groundwater recharge and stormwater management. In addition, the bill would also require, upon the next revision of the housing element, on or after January 1, 2008, that the safety element identify information regarding flood hazards and establish a set of comprehensive goal, policies and objectives for the protection of the community from unreasonable risks of flooding, including minimizing risks to new development. Finally, the bill would require cities and counties within the boundaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District to submit the draft element or draft amendment of the safety element to the Reclamation Board. The Board would be required to review the draft element or an existing safety element and offer recommendations for changes regarding issues of land use policies in areas subject to flooding and methods to reduce such flood risk within those areas. Cities and counties shall consider the Board's recommendations and make written findings stating the reasons for not accepting a specified Board recommendation.</p> <p><b>As Amended 6/27/06</b></p>	Senate Appropriations Committee
<p><b>AB 1899 (Wolk)</b></p> <p><b>Land use: flood protection.</b></p>	<p>This bill would revise the Subdivision Map Act to require the Reclamation Board or the Department of Water Resources to file with the legislative body of any local agency having jurisdiction, a map or amended map of any flood hazard zone in the watersheds of the Sacramento River or the San Joaquin River within 30 days of learning of a proposed project of 25 units or more, except for infill projects, within that flood hazard zone. The bill</p>	Senate Appropriations Committee

Bill #	Category / Summary	Status
	<p>would also require cities or counties to transmit a copy of the proposed tentative map for the subdivision to the Board within 30 days after the tentative map application is complete. Within 120 days after receiving a copy of a proposed subdivision map, or within 60 days after receiving a flood protection information analysis prepared by another agency, the Board shall verify in writing whether the lands upon which the project is proposed to be located, meet the 100-year standard. The bill would also require the Board, no later 90 days after verifying compliance with the 100-year standard, to determine whether the lands of the proposed project are “reasonably anticipated” to meet the 200-year standard within 10 years of the date on which a final subdivision map is issued for the project. The bill would also require the board to adopt standards for Central Valley urban levees. The recent amendments delete all provisions relieving the state, cities and counties from civil liability for verification of flood risks, and require the Board to approve a capital outlay program for financing local flood projects prior to making a determination about whether the lands of the proposed project will meet the 200-year standard.</p> <p><b>As Amended 6/27/06</b></p>	
<p><b>AB 2500 (Laird)</b></p> <p><b>Project levee upgrade funds: local safety plans.</b></p>	<p>This bill would prohibit the state from allocating or expending funds for the upgrade of a project levee that protects an urban area in which more than 10,000 people reside, unless the beneficiary city or county or the local agency who operates and maintains the project enters into an agreement with the department pursuant to which the city or county agrees to adopt, within 2 years, a safety plan that includes specified components, including a flood preparedness plan; a levee patrol plan for high water situations; a flood fight plan; a flood water removal plan; and an evacuation plan.</p> <p><b>As Amended 6/13/06</b></p>	<p>Senate Appropriations Committee</p>
	<b>Flood Insurance / Notification</b>	
<p><b>AB 3022 (Umberg)</b></p> <p><b>Flood control: seller disclosures.</b></p>	<p>This bill would require on or after January 1, 2008, that the safety element address flood management factors, which include, among other things, residential areas determined to be in a 100-year flood plain. The bill would also require an express, written disclosure that any subdivided lands offered for sale or lease or any residential property that is</p>	<p>Senate Appropriations Committee</p>

Bill #	Category / Summary	Status
	transferred, as specified, contains a statement that the property is located within a 100-year flood plain. <b>As Amended 5/11/06</b>	
<b>AB 1898 (Jones)</b>  <b>Flood insurance.</b>	Effective July 1, 2007, this bill would enact the California Flood Insurance Program and would require property owners located in the Sacramento and San Joaquin watersheds to maintain flood insurance, unless the state or agency responsible for operation of the levee system protecting the property from flooding has certified that the levee system protecting the property provides at least 200 year flood protection. <b>As Amended 4/18/06</b>	Failed Assembly Banking and Finance Committee 4/24  <b>(DEAD)</b>
	<b>Flood Liability</b>	
<b>AB 3050 (Jones)</b>  <b>Flood control liability.</b>	This bill would provide that the state is entitled to a right of contribution against any local public entity whose actions contribute, or whose failure to act contributes, to the failure of a flood control project when that failure causes property damage or personal injury and a judgment has been entered against the state. The bill would also subject a local public entity to joint liability and the state's right of contribution to the extent that the local public entity increases the amount of property damage sustained in a flood by approving new development in a previously "undeveloped area", as defined. <b>As Amended 5/31/06</b>	Assembly - Third Reading File  <b>(DEAD)</b>
<b>AB 1528 (Jones)</b>  <b>Flood control liability</b>	This bill would provide that the state is entitled to a right of contribution against any local public entity whose actions contribute, or whose failure to act contributes, to the failure of a flood control project when that failure causes property damage or personal injury and a judgment has been entered against the state. The bill would also subject a local public entity to joint liability and the state's right of contribution to the extent that the local public entity increases the amount of property damage sustained in a flood by approving new development in a previously "undeveloped area", as defined. The bill would also require cities and counties benefiting from upgrades to project levees to enter into an agreement with the State to share in potential liability as a condition of the State providing assurances to the federal government. <b>As Amended 6/21/06</b>	Senate Judiciary Committee
	<b>Permit Streamlining</b>	
<b>AB 1039</b>	This bill exempts specified levee and highway and	Chapter 31, Statutes of

<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Category / Summary</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>(Nunez/Perata)</b>  <b>Government: environment: bonds: transportation.</b>	bridge seismic retrofit projects, from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In addition, this bill requires the Secretary for Resources to convene agencies with environmental and water quality permit authority over flood protection projects to coordinate the issue of unified, consolidated permits for specified "urgent levee repairs" funded by the Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Fund of 2006. The exemption shall only remain in effect until July 1, 2016.	2006
<b>AB 1877 (Nakanishi)</b>  <b>Flood control: natural community conservation plan.</b>	This bill would require the Department of Fish and Game to develop a Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), in agreement with the Reclamation Board, and consultation from appropriate federal, state and local agencies for the purposes of exempting flood control activities covered by the NCCP from regulation under the streambed alteration agreement process. <b>As Amended 4/27/06</b>	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee <b>(DEAD)</b>
<b>AB 2026 (Aghazarian)</b>  <b>Flood control.</b>	This bill would require the Reclamation Board to give the highest consideration to its mission to protect the health and safety of the public, and to give due consideration to fish and wildlife, recreation and environmental factors. In addition, the bill would exempt actions undertaken by The Reclamation Board or local agencies for routine maintenance of levees from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). <b>As Introduced 2/14/06</b>	Failed Assembly Natural Resources Committee 4/24  <b>(DEAD)</b>
<b>AB 2027 (La Malfa)</b>  <b>Flood control projects.</b>	This bill would eliminate a requirement of the Delta Levee Maintenance Subventions program which requires a not-net loss determination to be made by the Department of Fish and Game for approval of levee maintenance plans that call for the use of channels used by fisheries or wildlife habitat. <b>As Introduced 2/14/06</b>	Failed Assembly Water, Parks & Wildlife Committee 4/25  <b>(DEAD)</b>
<b>AB 2029 (Villines)</b>  <b>State of emergency: imminent breach or failure flood threat emergency.</b>	This bill would include in the definition of "state of emergency" under the Emergency Services Act, an imminent breach or failure flood threat emergency as determined by the Governor.  <b>As Amended 4/24/06</b>	Assembly Natural Resources and Water Committee  <b>(DEAD)</b>
<b>AB 2162 (Maze)</b>  <b>Flood control and environmental restoration</b>	This bill would prohibit DWR, The Reclamation Board, and the California Bay-Delta Authority from allocating funds on behalf of any flood control or environmental restoration project if the project	Failed Assembly Water, Parks & Wildlife Committee 4/25

<b>Bill #</b>	<b>Category / Summary</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>projects: levees: transfer.</b>	involves the transfer of the ownership of any portion of a project or nonproject levee, or any flood control facility, to a nonpublic entity. <b>As Introduced 2/21/06</b>	<b>(DEAD)</b>
<b>SB 1527 (Aanestad)</b>  <b>Flood protection work: consolidated permits or approvals.</b>	This bill would require The Reclamation Board to prepare a master environmental impact report in connection with routine operation or maintenance activities, and rehabilitation and repair activities, undertaken by the board or local agencies on behalf of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project.  <b>As Amended 3/27/06</b>	Held in Senate Natural Resources & Water Committee  <b>(DEAD)</b>
	<b>Delta Issues</b>	
<b>AB 798 (Wolk)</b>  <b>Delta levee maintenance</b>	To take effect immediately, this bill would extend the Delta Levee Maintenance Subvention Program to July 1, 2010, and requires the Department of Water Resources to identify levees that are at risk of failure based on a specified evaluation of Delta levees, and to make by January 1, 2008 funding priority recommendations to the Legislature and Governor for levee maintenance or improvement projects. (note: the program officially expired on July 1, 2006). <b>As Amended 6/26/06</b>	Senate Appropriations Committee
<b>AB 2208 (Jones)</b>  <b>Delta levee and conveyance system: water user fee.</b>	This bill would require the Department of Water Resources (DWR), in consultation with The Reclamation Board, to conduct a study by January 1, 2008, recommending persons and entities who should pay a user fee, in accordance with the "beneficiary pays" principle, which would be used to create a dedicated revenue stream for improvements and maintenance of the Delta levee and conveyance system. <b>As Amended 6/20/06</b>	Senate Appropriations Committee
<b>SB 1574 (Kuehl)</b>  <b>Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.</b>	This bill would provide a statutory framework for implementing the Delta Vision Process by requiring the Secretary of the Resources Agency to convene a committee which would and develop and submit to the Governor and the Legislature, on or before December 31, 2008, a "Blueprint for a Sustainable Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta" with specified components, including ecosystem functions, land use and land use patterns, transportation issues, utility uses, water supply uses, recreation uses, and flood management strategies. <b>As Amended 6/22/06</b>	Assembly Appropriations Committee  <b>Hearing: 8/9/06</b>
	<b>Flood Projects</b>	

Bill #	Category / Summary	Status
<b>AB 2348 (Laird)</b>  <b>Flood control: Pajaro River.</b>	<p>This bill would adopt and authorize a flood control project on the Pajaro River in Monterey and Santa Cruz counties at an estimated cost to the State of the sum that may be appropriated by the Legislature for State cooperation, upon the recommendation and advice of the Department of Water Resources. The bill would require both counties to carry out the project and give prescribed assurances to the Secretary of the Army, thereby imposing a State-mandated local program. This bill would require DWR review and oversight of project feasibility and design prior to adoption and authorization of the project.</p> <p><b>As Amended 5/26/06</b></p>	<p>Senate Appropriations Committee</p>
<b>SB 831 (Machado)</b>  <b>Flood control: Stockton Metropolitan Area Flood Control Project.</b>	<p>This bill would authorize the Reclamation Board to accept the transfer of any project works of the Stockton Metropolitan Area Flood Control Project constructed by the San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency that is considered an addition or extension to the Bear Creek and Mormon Slough Projects. Prior to acceptance of the project works, the Reclamation Board, the San Joaquin Area County Flood Control Agency and its member agencies, San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the City of Stockton, and San Joaquin County, would be required to enter into a hold harmless and indemnification agreement.</p> <p><b>As Amended 5/30/06</b></p>	<p>Assembly Consent Calendar</p>
<b>SB 1343 (Chesbro)</b>  <b>Flood control: Middle Creek Ecosystem restoration project.</b>	<p>This bill would adopt and authorize the Middle Creek ecosystem restoration and flood protection project in Lake County. This bill would provide that, if the project receives the recommendation of The Reclamation Board and is authorized by Congress in 2006, the Legislature would be authorized to appropriate funds for this project. This bill would further authorize the Board to pay 50 percent of the nonfederal capital costs of the habitat restoration, recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement features of the project. The bill would require the Lake County Flood Control and Water Conservation District to carry out the project as the local sponsor.</p> <p><b>As Amended 4/18/06</b></p>	<p>Held in Senate Appropriations Committee</p> <p><b>(DEAD)</b></p>
	<b>Miscellaneous</b>	
<b>AB 2000 (LaMalfa)</b>  <b>Levees: unlawful entry.</b>	<p>This bill would make it an infraction for a person to unlawfully enter upon a levee upon which signs forbidding trespass are displayed. If the crime results in a conviction, a fine for the first offense would be \$250, a second offense would result in a</p>	<p>Held in Senate Natural Resources Committee</p> <p><b>(DEAD)</b></p>

Bill #	Category / Summary	Status
	<p>\$500 fine, and each additional offense occurring within one year of a second or subsequent offense would result in a fine of \$1000.</p> <p><b>As Amended 6/14/06</b></p>	
<p><b>SB 902 (Denham)</b></p> <p><b>The Upper San Joaquin River Storage and San Joaquin River Restoration Bond Act of 2006.</b></p>	<p>This bill would have established the Upper San Joaquin River Storage and San Joaquin River Restoration Bond Act of 2006 for \$1.225 billion dollars to be submitted to the voters on the November 2006 ballot. The purposes of the bond would have been to finance specific river storage and restoration projects. The Assembly policy committee recently removed all the bill's provisions relating to the construction of a new surface storage project and restoration of the San Joaquin River. The new provisions will state legislative intent to enact a storage bond without referencing surface or groundwater storage.</p> <p><b>As Amended 5/11/06</b></p>	<p>Assembly Appropriations Committee</p>
<p><b>SB 1251 (Alquist)</b></p> <p><b>Flood and stormwater management planning.</b></p>	<p>This bill would require the Director of Water Resources, not later than June 30, 2007, to convene a task force, to prepare a report on the risk and potential economic consequences of flooding in those areas of California not studied by DWR in its 2005 report titled "Flood Warnings: Responding to California's Flood Crisis." The task force shall prepare and submit a report to the Legislature, not later than December 31, 2008, with regard to its findings and recommendations.</p> <p><b>As Amended 4/17/06</b></p>	<p>Held in Senate Appropriations Committee</p> <p><b>(DEAD)</b></p>